



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/717,974	11/21/2003	Bo Yeon Kim	9988.081.00-US	8004

30827 7590 06/05/2007
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

HANSEN, JAMES ORVILLE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3637

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/05/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/717,974

Applicant(s)

KIM, BO YEON

Examiner

James O. Hansen

Art Unit

3637

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/10/06 & 3/6/07.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Prior Art Admission of Figures 1-4 [known hereafter as APAA] in view of Sussenbach [U.S. Patent No. 2,452,805] and Birtwistle et al., [U.S. Patent No. 4,989,752]. APAA teaches of a cabinet cover for a home appliance comprising: a cabinet cover body (12) having an installation hole (12a) at a predetermined location for receiving from a rear side a control panel (26) for controlling the home appliance; and an aesthetic member (14) covering the installation hole, wherein a peripheral edge of the member is attached to the rear side of the cabinet cover body via an adhesive and a front side surface of the member is attached to the rear side of the cabinet cover body via a weld. APAA does not show the front side surface of the member being attached to the rear side of the cover body via an adhesive agent or show a peripheral edge of the member attached to the cover body via a weld joint [APPA shows an opposite arrangement]. Sussenbach (figures 1-4) is cited as an evidence reference to show that it was known in the art to utilize both sealing means (S) and welding (welds) to attach two plates (1, 3) together in a parallel arrangement. The sealing means being applied to the back surface of one plate and to the front surface of the other plate so as to secure the plates together for the welding process (col. 1, lines 13-19). As such, the position is taken that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in

Art Unit: 3637

the art at the time the invention was made to modify the securing technique of APAA in view of Sussenbach's teaching because this arrangement provides an enhanced securing assembly since the sealing means is applied between both plate members thereby affording a more robust seal due to the increased surface area in contact with the sealing means and this seal allows the welded members to be more securely held and aligned during the welding process {col. 1}. As to the weld joint being formed along the peripheral edge. Birtwistle (figures 1-5) is cited as an evidence reference to show that the application of a weld (43 for example) along a peripheral edge of a member (17 for example) to be joined to another member is old and well known. As such, the position is taken that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the securing technique of the prior art in view of Birtwistle's teaching because this arrangement provides a secure attachment seam along an edge of the joined member that is aesthetically pleasing while providing a beveled or contoured surface between the joined members. As to claim 2, the aesthetic member is larger than the installation hole (fig. 3). As to claim 3, the cabinet cover body and the aesthetic member are inherently made of a stainless steel based material (as evident by the cross-hatched sections). As to claim 4, the body and member may be manufactured using an array of cutting devices as is conventionally known in the art. It is noted that the method of forming the device is not germane to the issue of patentability of the device itself and therefore, this limitation has not been given patentable weight. As to claim 5, the aesthetic member is provided with a plurality of holes (fig. 4 for example) for receiving the control panel. As to claim 6, an adhesive agent (sealing means) as noted above attaches the front side of the member to the rear side of the cover body before the welding process. As to

claim 12, the prior art when modified teaches that the adhesive agent (sealing means) is between the front side surface of the member and the rear side of the cover body. Claims 7-11, 13 & 14 are similarly claimed and thereby the limitations are disclosed in the above rejection.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Torisu describes a weld about a peripheral edge of a member. Vaughan discloses the use of spot welding along with an adhesive. Miyamoto et al., describes a weld along an inner periphery of a plate.

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date

Art Unit: 3637

of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James O. Hansen whose telephone number is 571-272-6866. The examiner can be reached on Monday-Friday between 8-4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lanna Mai can be reached on 571-272-6867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



James O. Hansen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3637

JOH
May 25, 2007